

**II. Remarks**

**A. Status of Claims**

Claim 75 has been amended without prejudice or admission for proper antecedent basis.

Claim 85 has been amended without prejudice or admission to delete the term “prevention.”

It is respectfully submitted that the elected invention is encompassed by claims 75-86, 89, 91 and 92.

Claims 75-86, 89, 91 and 92 are pending, with claims 76-84, 86, 89, 91 and 92 being “objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable once the rejection of the base claim (and intervening claims) has been overcome.” *Office Action, page 4.*

**B. Substance of Interview**

In accordance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.133, Applicants herein make of record the substance of the telephone interview conducted on November 19, 2009, between the undersigned attorney and Examiner Humera N. Sheikh.

During the interview, the undersigned attorney explained the amendments and arguments presented in the response filed on September 3, 2009, and submitted that the cited references do not teach or suggest dosage forms comprising hydrophobic means for sequestering the opioid antagonist as recited in the present claims.

Appl. Serial No. 10/700,906  
Response dated December 14, 2009  
Reply to Office Action mailed on December 10, 2009

The Examiner indicated that the term “prevention” in claim 85 may raise an enablement issue. The undersigned attorney respectfully disagreed and suggested that this issue be revisited once the Examiner had an opportunity to review the specification in detail.

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the interview, and respectfully request that the substance of interview be made of record.

**C. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 75 and 85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, allegedly as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner suggested “that the term ‘prevention’ be deleted [from claim 85] to overcome this rejection. *Office Action, page 4.*

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

However, in an effort to advance prosecution, the term “prevention” has been deleted from claim 85 in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Appl. Serial No. 10/700,906  
Response dated December 14, 2009  
Reply to Office Action mailed on December 10, 2009

### **III. Conclusion**

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited. According to currently recommended Patent Office policy, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in the event that a telephonic interview will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:   
Oleg Ioselevich  
Reg No. 56,963

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940